



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Zahn has left undiscussed one feature of the Cyprian legend upon which I could wish much more light. The "action" of book I is as follows: A wealthy young man, name Aglaïdas, falls in love with Justina, who repulses his advances, replying that she is the "bride of Christ." Aglaïdas tries to carry her off by force. Baffled in this, he has recourse to the renowned magician Cyprian. The latter calls upon a "demon," who wishes to know why he is summoned. Cyprian tells him what is expected of him, and, to make sure of his capacities, inquires what he has already done. The demon answers: "I have abjured God. I have shaken the heavens and dragged down the angels from above. Eve I seduced, and I robbed Adam of paradise. Cain I taught to murder his brother. Thorns and thistles have sprung up for me. I established theatres and processions, adultery, and idolatry. I taught the children of Israel to make (golden) calves, and prompted to the crucifixion of Christ." But, despite all this boasting, the demon is baffled by Justina. Thereupon Cyprian calls up a second demon, still mightier. He also is baffled, and so in turn a third. This trait of a boasting enumeration of evil deeds we find in two other legends, which, like Justina, have for their object the laudation of perpetual virginity—namely, the legends of St. Juliana and St. Margaret. In both these legends a devil appears to the saint in prison, is overcome there by her, and thereupon is made to confess his wickednesses. The confessions resemble strongly in form and also in substance the boasting of Cyprian's demon.<sup>1</sup> In a third legend, that of St. Katharine, intimately allied with the other two, no such demon appears. Zahn makes it evident, p. 110–114, that the prototype of all such saints as Justina, Katharine, Margaret, etc., is to be found in Thecla of Iconium. The Thecla legend is among the very earliest, dating from the end of the first or beginning of the second century. It is undoubtedly the simplest and most primitive conception of virginal purity. It is free from the superheated rhetoric that mars later legends of a like character, and is also free from devils and witchcraft. The question, then, naturally arises: whence this (foreign) element in Juliana and Margaret? Is there any connection between them and Cyprian-Justina? Has one set of stories borrowed from the other, or is there a source common to both, and where are we to look for such a source? I propound a number of queries without being able to answer one of them. Yet I can not help suspecting that all the demonology in the secondary layer of Christian literature is a borrowing from Greek, possibly here and there from Syrian superstition. At any rate, the reader will perceive how impossible it is to progress safely in the study of Christian literature until we first establish certain *points de repère*.

J. M. HART.

---

A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect, by D. B. MONRO. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1882. 8vo. pp. XXIV, 344.

Monro's grammar is on an entirely different plan from Ahrens's *Formenlehre*, with which our author in his preface virtually compares his work. It is not merely that Ahrens's grammar is old and treated only of the Homeric inflections. Ahrens's work was paedagogic quite as much as scientific; it was intended for

<sup>1</sup> See Einkenkel's pamphlet, *Ueber die Verfasser einiger neuangelsächsischer Schriften*, Leipzig, 1881, and its conclusion in the *Anglia*, V 91.

use in elementary instruction as well as to serve as a foundation for the historical, scientific treatment of Greek grammar. He distinctly claimed that it was not to be judged by a scientific standard. Thus, even in his second edition, Göttingen 1869, he gives without qualification the old view (which has been handed down by tradition to this day in most of our preparatory schools) of the *distraction* of contract verbs, explaining *ὄραν* as formed by prefixing a short *a* to the second vowel of *ὄρᾱν*, which was formed by contraction from *ὄράειν*. The work before us, on the other hand, is not meant for elementary instruction, although many a teacher will be so delighted with the clearness and completeness of many of the statistics and explanations that he will be tempted to give them to classes which are not ready for such "strong meat." Monro does not allow paedagogic scruples to interfere with his scientific statements, although he avoids the use of diacritic marks like *γ*, *a*<sup>1</sup>, *a*<sup>2</sup>, etc.

The editions of Homer, on which the grammar is based, are those of Wolf (1804-1807), Bekker (1858), La Roche (1867-1876). Thus, the author disregards some of Nauck's peculiarities like *Ἡρακλεείη*, and does not mention the forms which Nauck prefers for the contract verbs, *σαοῖς*, *σαέσκον* κτλ. He admits freely, however, the gen. sing. of the 2d decl. in -οο, prefers *ἔσσ'* (*ἔσσι*) to *εἰς*, and says that the loss of the final *ι* in the dat. plur. of the 1st and 2d decl. may, in the great majority of cases, be regarded as due to elision, as *σοῖς' ἐτάροισιν* for *σοῖς ἐτάροισιν*.

The author begins by analyzing the verb and classifying the endings and, modifications of the stem, following with prudence the views of Johannes Schmidt, Brugman, and the rest, in the doctrine of "short forms" of the stem, the length of stems with *ε*, and the like. This division of the work ends with a chapter on the accentuation of the verb (pp. 1-56). He then passes to the discussion of nouns (adjectives and pronouns), their stems, suffixes and endings, and their formation. Under compound nouns is an article on Greek proper names which gives the gist of Fick's view (pp. 57-90). Then follows the use of the cases and numbers (pp. 91-122); of the prepositions, following for the most part Hoffmann and Tycho Mommsen (pp. 123-152); of the infinitive and participle (pp. 153-168); of the pronoun (pp. 168-193); of the moods (pp. 194-240); the particles (pp. 240-269); metre and quantity, including a careful discussion of the digamma (pp. 270-309). Appendixes follow: A, on the tenses with stems ending in *ᾱ*; B, on *σ* in verbal stems; C, on *η* and *ει* in Homer; D, on the assimilated forms; and E, on the order of the particles and enclitic pronouns. Then follows a satisfactory group of indexes: I of Homeric forms, II of subjects, III of the chief passages referred to.

The book deserves and will receive the heartiest welcome. It shows deep and broad learning, most intimate acquaintance with the poems themselves, as well as with the best authorities on individual questions. In following these authorities, excellent and independent judgment is exercised. The statistics are full and seem to be trustworthy; the explanations of the origin and growth of forms and constructions are clear; the examples are generally well chosen and the translations are sometimes extremely felicitous. The author's definition of the so-called *tnesis* (which schoolboys still regard as a kind of surgical operation which Homer was allowed to perform under the general authority of "poetic license") and his genetic treatment of the uses of the prepositions, are very

happy. Teachers will welcome also his statement of final clauses with *εἰ*, where the "end aimed at is represented as a *supposition*, instead of being a direct purpose, as *ἤλυσθον, εἰ τινά μοι κτλ.*, 'I have come *in the hope* that you may tell,' etc." Perhaps it would have been better, however, if the author had not tried to explain so much. He makes refined distinctions where it is not easy to follow him, and sometimes where he seems doubtful himself. For instance, §299 *fg.*, he explains with Delbrück all the uses of the optative from the meaning of *wish*, with the manner of a man who is telling us just "how it really is," but in §317 he discusses again the original meaning of the mood, and ends in the tone of one who sees great difficulties in the way of the theory. Among the different steps which the optative takes, Monro puts "(*δ*) a gentle or deferential imperative, conveying advice, suggestion, or the like." Among the untranslated examples under this head is Γ 406 *ἥσο παρ' αὐτὸν ἰούσα . . . μηδ' ἐτι σοῖσι πῶδεσσιν ὑποστρέψειας* "Ὀλυμπον. If we should translate this by the phrase by which the preceding example is translated, it would read "Suppose you don't return to Olympus," which is hardly Helen's tone as she addresses Aphrodite.

Monro's distinction between *ὅς τις* and *ὅς τε* seems at least uncertain. He illustrates from ζ 286 *καὶ δ' ἄλλη νεμεσῶ ἢ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι | ἦ τ' ἀέκητι φίλων κτλ.* "Here *ἦ τις* insists on the inclusion of all members of the class (*any one who* —), *ἦ τε* prepares us for the class characteristics (*one of the kind that* —)." He asserts that of the five relatives, *ὅ, ὃ τε, ὅς, ὅς τε, ὅς τις*, "each has a distinct shade of meaning" (§266), but at the end of §270 we are told that the three forms of the conjunction *ὅ, ὃ τε, ὃ τι*, "do not differ perceptibly in meaning." For the present many lovers of Homer can cherish the same belief concerning the meaning of some of the forms of the relative pronoun.

The treatment of *κέν* and *ἄν* is interesting though not convincing in all points. Our author rejects the view that *κέν* is Aeolic on the ground that "a foreign or non-Ionic element in Homer in all probability is to be found if at all in isolated words and phrases." The primary use of *ἄν* and *κέν* is to show that the speaker is thinking of particular instances or occasions. The Homeric use of *τέ* is precisely the opposite. We are told that "the *κέν* marks the alternative"; in §275, *κέν* (in *ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα κτλ.*, A 183) marks "that the speaker's threatened action is the counterpart of what is imposed upon him"; in §282, *κέν* shows reference to a future occasion; in §282, "the want of *ἄν* or *κέν* (in Γ 286 *ἦ τε . . . πέληται*) is doubtless owing to the vagueness of the future event contemplated." After many such explanations it is almost a surprise to be told that "in one or two places the use of *ἄν* is more difficult to explain."

The careful preparation of the book is evident on every page. Only here and there do we meet with manifest slips. *E. g.* it strikes us oddly to find on p. 49 *-ομεθον* given as the ending of the 1st dual, subj. mid., of the non-thematic stems; and p. 52 *-οιμεθον* for the optative. *-μεθον* is given in the scheme of personal endings p. 3, but on p. 5 it is remarked that the 1st dual *-μεθον* occurs only in Ψ 485. On p. 63, *ἐλεος* is put among nouns with stems in *-εες*, although τὸ *ἐλεος* is found only in writings of the Alexandrine period or later, and the Homeric verb-forms do not indicate a stem *ἐλεες*. The assumption of such a stem for *ἐλεεινός* and *νηλεής* does not justify the placing of the noun in that class. On p. 119, as an example of a plural participle with a singular nominative and verb, we find *ἐκίνηθεν δὲ φάλαγγες ἐλπόμενοι*. On p. 167, φ 115

οὐ κέ μοι ἀχρυνμένῳ τάδε δώματα πότνια μήτηρ | λείποι is translated "It would be no distress to me," etc., a translation which is grammatically correct, but which probably would not be defended by the author. It is a slip similar to that made by Wagner in his edition of the *Phaedo*, where on 91 Β ἤττον . . . ἀρδὴς ἔσομαι ὀδυρόμενος, he thinks it very strange that no editor should have seen that a μή or an ἦ had dropt out before ὀδυρόμενος. Curious also is the translation on p. 227 of Σ 464 αἶ γάρ μιν θανάτοιο δυσσχέος ὧδε δυνάμην κτλ., "As surely as I wish I could save him from death," for "Would that I could as surely save him from death as furnish him this armor." A careless use of an example is found on p. 252; the enclitic τοί is "especially used where a speaker wishes to imply that he is saying as little as possible, as II. 4, 405 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι." Other uses of examples might be criticised as p. 265: "The use of κέν to mark contrast may be seen in II. 11, 408 οἶδα γὰρ ὅττι κακοὶ μὲν ἀποίχονται πολέμοιο | δὲ δέ κ' ἀριστεύησι κτλ.," where the principal mark of the contrast surely lies in the μὲν and δέ. On p. 214 we are told that the subjunctive is used without ἄν or κέν in Σ 135 where Thetis tells her son not to enter the battle πρίν γ' ἐμὲ . . . ἰδῆαι, "because it is not meant to refer to a particular occasion when the condition will be fulfilled"; but the occasion is particular enough even though the time is left indefinite.

As an example of the comitative use of the instrumental dative is introduced Thuc. I 81 τῇ γῇ δουλεῦσαι, with a reference to Mr. Riddell and his *Digest of Platonic Idioms*. This example is so very uncertain (or downright unlikely) that we can ascribe its introduction only to the author's affection for Mr. Riddell, to whose memory this work is inscribed and whose *Digest* seems to have been the source of more guidance and inspiration to Mr. Monro than to most American scholars.

To the examples under §122, *γεραίτερος* might well be added.

Misprints are few and generally not troublesome. On p. 113, l. 1, 226 should be read for 736. The name of the editor of Herodian is twice printed as Lenz, instead of Lentz.

It would have been a convenience if, instead of repeating the heading "Homeric Grammar," on each left-hand page, a significant headline had been given. As it stands we have the same headlines "Homeric Grammar.—Clauses with εἰ," on pp. 210–211 and 232–233, with nothing to indicate that here subjunctive clauses and there optative clauses are discussed. But let it not seem trifling to make such criticisms on a book which will be both a luxury and a necessity to every scholar. We may congratulate ourselves on having in our own language a book which fills a gap which is felt by the Germans and the French.

T. D. S.

---

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, von Dr. FRIEDRICH KLUGE,  
Privatdocent an der Universität Strassburg. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.  
I u. II Lieferungen.

The want of a trustworthy and handy Etymological Dictionary of the German language has long been felt. Grimm's dictionary is a storehouse of information in a historical point of view, nor is it at all defective in the etymological part; but for the general reader Grimm is too expensive, and requires too long a search to